APPENDIX A — PETITION FOR RULEMAKING DATED AUGUST 24, 1999

THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION
DISABILITY RIGHTS SECTION

In the Matter of

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF THEATRE OWNERS,

Petitioner.

Petition for Rulemaking
Re: Stadium-Style Motion Picture Theatres
Docket No. _____

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 553(e), the National Association of Theatre Owners ("NATO") respectfully petitions the Department of Justice ("Department") to promulgate a lawful rule for the placement of wheelchair spaces in "stadium style" motion picture theatre auditoriums which conforms to the requirements of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12181, *et seq.* ("ADA") . Under 5 U.S.C. § 553(b) and (c), issuance of the rule requested herein must be preceded by, *inter alia*: (1) adequate notice of the proposed rule published in the Federal Register and (2) the opportunity for interested persons, such as NATO, to "participate in the rule making through submission of written data, views, or arguments. . . ."

Appendix A

Stadium style motion picture theatres are intended to enhance the movie viewing experience by providing seating on tiered risers. Stadium-style motion picture theatres are a recent but especially popular trend because they offer all patrons an unobstructed view of the screen. In exchange, a substantial portion, if not all, of the theatre auditorium is characterized by chairs located on continuous risers that vary from 2 inches to 18 inches in height, depending on the design of the theatre. To reach the seats within such an auditorium, patrons have to climb stairs rather than walk up sloped aisles typical of older theatres. This situation presents obvious difficulties for wheelchair locations. In order to fulfill the objectives of the stadium-style design in a manner consistent with the requirements of Title III, several factors must be analyzed and considered. The objectives of the ADA must be synthesized with the practical and safety limitations inherent in the nature of this type of seating arrangement.

The rulemaking requested herein is called for because neither the ADA nor the regulations promulgated thereunder specify the location in which wheelchair spaces must be placed in stadium style motion picture theatre auditoriums. Stadium-style seating was not common in theatres when the ADA and the regulations were under consideration and location of wheelchair seating in such theatres was not addressed by the Congress or any of the parties involved in the development of ADA regulations. Before the Department adopts, advocates and seeks to enforce a position regarding the placement of such wheelchair spaces, it must permit the issue to be appropriately reviewed, considered, analyzed and otherwise "vetted" through the notice-and-comment

procedures of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. § 553.

In derogation of this requirement, the Department has already adopted and is attempting to enforce one or more rules which require operators of stadium style movie auditoriums to locate wheelchair spaces in areas that provide the patron with: 1) a "vertical viewing angle" that is equal to or less than the ***median*** vertical viewing angle for all of the seats in the auditorium (hereafter, "Median Vertical Viewing Angle Rule"; 2) a "horizontal viewing angle" that is equal to or better than the ***median*** horizontal viewing angle for all of the seats in the auditorium (hereafter, "Median Horizontal Viewing Angle Rule"; or (3) both. Neither the Median Vertical Viewing Angle Rule nor the Median Horizontal Viewing Angle Rule is set forth in the ADA or the regulations duly promulgated thereunder. The Median Vertical Viewing Angle Rule is based, at least in part, on a purported industry "guideline" which predated stadium style seating in theatres, represents lofty objectives rather than actual practice, and was not subject to the review and scrutiny of the notice and comment procedures under the APA. Petitioner respectfully submits it is incumbent upon the Department to void its improperly adopted Median Vertical Viewing Angle Rule and Median Horizontal Viewing Angle Rule and to replace them with a rule lawfully promulgated in compliance with the APA's prior-notice-and-comment requirements.

Appendix A

I. BACKGROUND

Petitioner NATO

Headquartered in North Hollywood, California, NATO is the national trade organization of the motion picture theatre industry. NATO is the largest trade association of motion picture theatres in the world, and its members currently operate over 19,000 motion picture screens located in all of the 50 states. A list of current NATO members is provided in Exhibit A hereto. Many NATO members currently operate stadium style movie theatres and/or are in the process of constructing such theatres. NATO members have sought in good faith to comply fully with the requirements of Title III in designing and constructing the stadium style auditoriums. However, they have been faced with conclusory, vague, untested, unfounded, unsubstantiated, confusing and inconsistent pronouncements, indications and statements of position by the Department, the courts and various advocacy rights groups throughout the country regarding the appropriate placement of wheelchair locations in stadium style auditoria. Several NATO members currently face actual or threatened private and government lawsuits and investigations challenging the wheelchair seating in their existing or proposed stadium style theatres. This patchwork of enforcement efforts is leading to an array of inconsistent interpretations and pronouncements by courts regarding the application of Title III to stadium style seating arrangements.

NATO has standing to pursue this Petition on behalf of its members because (1) its members would otherwise have sanding in their own right; (2) the interests which NATO

seeks to protect are germane to the purpose of NATO; and (3) the Department can provide the relief requested by NATO without requiring the participation of individual members of NATO.

Promulgation of the ADAAG

In enacting Title III of the ADA, Congress specifically designated the Attorney General and the United States Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board ("Access Board")[1] to promulgate the standards to be used in administering and enforcing Title III. Section 12186(b), 42 U.S.C., provides that "[n]ot later than 1 year after July 26, 1990, the Attorney General shall issue regulations in an accessible format to carry out the provisions of" Title III, including "standards applicable to [public accommodation] facilities. . . ." Congress also mandated that the Access Board issue minimum guidelines to implement Title III of the ADA. 42 U.S.C. § 12204.

In accordance with the ADA, the Access Board issued the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines ("ADAAG"). See 56 Fed. Reg. 35,408 (1991) (codified at 36 C.F.R. pt. 1191 (App. A). The Access Board promulgated its guidelines in accordance with APA notice-and-comment procedures. On the same day that the ADAAG was issued,

1. Originally, Congress created the Access Board to insure compliance with the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. § 4151, which governed accessibility to federally funded buildings. *See* 29 U.S.C. § 792. In 1992, Congress amended 29 U.S.C. § 792 to include an additional function for the Access Board – develop advisory guidelines for Titles II and III of the ADA. See 29 U.S.C. § 792(b)(2).

the Department adopted the ADAAG as its own regulations, entitled the Justice Department's Standards for Accessible Design ("JDSAD") (codified at 28 C.F.R. pt. 36 App. A).

ADAAG Standard 4.33.3

The ADAAG predated the advent of stadium style movie theatres. Accordingly, it contains no specific rule or guidance as to the location of wheelchair spaces in such theatres. Under "Standard 4.33.3" of the ADAAG, in auditoriums of less than 301 seats, or auditoriums of any size having sight lines that require slopes of greater than 5 percent, wheelchair seating may be "clustered" in a single location of the theatre. 28 C.F.R. Ch. I, Pt. 36, App. A, § 4.33.3. Where a single "cluster" of wheelchair seats is permitted, the regulations do not specify a precise location where builders must place the single cluster of seats, other than that they must adjoin an accessible route of egress. Standard 4.33.3 states, in pertinent part:

> Wheelchair areas shall be an integral part of any fixed seating plan and shall be provided so as to provide people with physical disabilities a choice of admission prices and lines of sight comparable to those for members of the general public. They shall adjoin an accessible route that also serves as a means of egress in case of emergency. . . . When the seating capacity exceeds 300, wheelchair spaces shall be provided in more than one location.

Appendix A

> EXCEPTION: Accessible viewing positions may be clustered for bleachers, balconies, and other areas having sight lines that require slopes of greater than 5 percent. Equivalent accessible viewing positions may be located on levels having accessible egress.

When Standard 4.33.3 was adopted motion picture theatres had sloped floors, one ticket price, and there were no reserved seats. In movie auditoria of under 301 seats, wheelchair locations could be placed in one location. The industry believed that the term "lines of sight" related to the ability of a patron to see over the head of the person in the rows in front.

Standard 4.33.3, like the ADA itself, makes no reference to a "vertical viewing angle" or a "horizontal viewing angle." It certainly does not purport to prescribe the maximum vertical or horizontal viewing angle that may be offered to wheelchair users in movie theatres. There also is no requirement set forth in Standard 4.33.3 that wheelchair locations receive a vertical or horizontal viewing angle that is equal to or less than the "median" viewing angle for all patrons in the auditorium. Nor is there evidence that either the Department or the Access Board intended that Standard 4.33.3 impose a maximum vertical or horizontal viewing angle requirement for movie theatres. Indeed, the requirement that wheelchair users receive "a choice of admission prices and lines of sight comparable to those for members of the general public" appears to have been aimed not at small movie theatres, but rather at large venues such as sports

stadiums and concert halls which have multiple ticket prices and reserved seats.[2]

The Median Vertical Viewing Angle Rule

Prior to the Summer of 1998, the Department had interpreted Section 4.33.3 in the context of movie theatres but had never required wheelchair seating positions to be located in a particular location of an auditorium to comply with the law. To the contrary, the Department had assured theatre owners and industry groups that, in theatres of 300 seats or less, wheelchair seating areas could permissibly be placed anywhere in the theatre under Section 4.33.3.

However, in July 1998, the Department filed an *amicus curaie* brief in an ADA action pending in El Paso, Texas which reflected an entirely new position by the Department that cannot be found in the language of the ADA or Standard 4.33.3. In its brief in *Lara v. Cinemark USA, Inc.*, No. EP-97-CA-502-H (W.D. Tex. July 20, 1998), the Department pronounced that "in stadium style seating, wheelchair locations must be provided lines of sight in the stadium style seats ***within the range of viewing angles as those offered to most of the general public*** in the stadium style seats, adjusted for seat tilt." Brief, at 8 (emphasis added). The Department subsequently clarified its position to require, at a minimum,

---

2. For example, if a baseball park offers seats (1) behind home plate, (2) behind first base, (3) behind third base, (4) at a "club" level and (5) around the outfield, the requirement that wheelchair receive "a choice of admission prices and lines of sight comparable to those for members of the general public" insures that the wheelchair users will be offered seating in multiple locations.

that wheelchair placements in stadium style theatres provide such viewers a vertical "viewing angle" to the screen that is at least as good as the "median" viewing angles in the auditorium.

The Department bases its Median Vertical Viewing Angle Rule at least in part, on a purported industry "guideline" which was not prepared with stadium style seating in mind, and which has never been subjected to analysis or scrutiny under the APA. In its *amicus* brief in *Lara*, the Department specifically pointed to the "SMPTE Engineering Guideline Design of Effective Cine Theaters, EG 18-1994" ("SMPTE Guideline"). The SMPTE Guideline was initially issued by the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers ("SMPTE") in the 1970s, well before the first stadium style motion picture theatre was in operation. Brief, at 3-4. In its brief, the Department cited, *inter alia*, the following as conclusions in the SEMPTE Guideline:

- "physical discomfort occurs when the vertical viewing angle to the top of the screen exceeds +35 degrees";

- "[p]hysical discomfort also occurs when the horizontal line of sight exceeds +15 degrees in either direction";

- "the 'optimum viewing zone' is from horizontal at eye level (0 degrees) to -30 degrees"; and

- "to avoid excessive vertical viewing angles and to bring the vertical angle closer to zero degrees, seat backs should be tilted the same amount, 12 to 15 degrees."

These "conclusions" were never subjected to the prior-notice-and-comment procedures of the APA.

The Median "Horizontal Viewing Angle" Rule

In addition to applying the Median Vertical Viewing Angle rule, the Department also has taken the position that wheelchair placements in stadium style theatres must provide a "horizontal viewing angle" which is equal to or better than the median "horizontal viewing angle" in the auditorium. Petitioner is not aware of any purported basis upon which the Department has relied in developing and applying this Rule.

The ADAAG Manual

In May of this year, the Access Board issued an "ADAAG Manual" which it refers to as a "guide to the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines." The ADAAG Manual states that in construing and applying Section 4.33.3, "[s]ight lines are calculated according to certain industry conventions and practices." Manual, at 117. Moreover, the Manual contains a diagram of four recommended audience wheelchair placements for a public auditorium. Manual, at 118. Only one of the four placements recommended by the Access Board would comply with the Department's Median Vertical Viewing Angle Rule or Median Horizontal Viewing Angle Rule.

Appendix A

II. A NOTICE AND COMMENT RULEMAKING IS REQUIRED

The Department's Median Vertical Viewing Angle Rule and Median Horizontal Viewing Angle Rule constitute "rules" under the APA; therefore, prior notice and an opportunity for comment by the public were a prerequisite to the adoption of each such rule. Under the APA, a "rule" is defined as "the whole or a part of an agency statement of general or particular applicability and future effect designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy. . . ." 5 U.S.C. § 551(4). A rule promulgated by an agency that is subject to the APA is invalid unless the agency first issues a public notice of proposed rulemaking which describes the substance of the proposed rule, and gives the public the opportunity to submit written comments; and if after receiving the comments it decides to promulgate the rule the agency must set forth the basis and purpose of the rule in a public statement. 5 U.S.C.§§ 553(b), (c). Public participation in rule-making is necessary to "allow the agency to benefit from the experience and input of the parties," *National Tour Brokers Ass'n v. United States*, 591 F.2d 896, 902 (D.C. Cir. 1978); and to "enable[] the agency . . . to educate itself before establishing rules and procedures which have a substantial impact on those regulated," *Texaco, Inc. v. FPC*, 412 F.2d 740, 744 (3rd Cir. 1969).

Although the APA's procedural requirements apply to "legislative" (or "substantive") rules and not to "interpretive rules," the determination of the maximum allowable vertical viewing angle for wheelchair placements in movie theatres certainly qualifies as a "legislative" rule. In its recent opinion

in *Caruso v. Blockbuster-Sony*, *supra*, the Third Circuit found that the Department had improperly engaged in legislative rulemaking in connection with its efforts to apply Standard 4.33.3 to the issue of whether wheelchair users are entitled to an unobstructed view over standing spectators. The court emphasized that if the Department believed "that the ADA should be interpreted to require that wheelchair users be given lines of sight equivalent to standing patrons . . . the [Department] can accomplish this end through notice-and-comment rulemaking." 1999 WL 185040 *9. As the trial court in Caruso explained:

> Congress has elected to pass a very general statute and leave it to the regulatory process to fill in the necessary details. Constructing a stadium or arena is an expensive, complex affair. If the law is to impose requirements to assist those with disabilities and to impose an obligation to make expensive retrofits if that law is violated, it is essential that those requirements be clearly articulated in the regulations. Compliance with APA rulemaking insures, hopefully at least, that all points of view are heard and that the resulting regulation provides concrete guidance to those embarking on such a Project.[3]

Stadium style seating movie theatres are also expensive and complex facilities and it is essential that all requirements for the construction of such facilities "be clearly articulated in

---

3. *Caruso v. Blockbuster-Sony Music Entertainment Centre*, 968 F. Supp. 210, 216 (D.N.J. 1997), *aff'd in part, rev'd in part*, __ F.3d __, 1999 W 185040 (3rd Cir. April 6, 1999).

. . . regulations" duly promulgated under the APA in a manner that insures that "all points of view are heard. . . ." *See also Independent Living Resources*, *supra*, 982 F. Supp. at 736 n. 55 ("the notice and comment requirement would be eviscerated if the [Department of Justice] could create new obligations simply by announcing a new interpretation of an existing regulation").

That prescription of a specific vertical or horizontal viewing angle for wheelchair placements constitutes legislative rulemaking is demonstrated by the opinion by Judge Posner in *Hoctor v. United States Department of Agriculture*, 82 F.3d 165 (7th Cir. 1996). In *Hoctor* the Department of Agriculture was tasked with enforcing the Animal Welfare Act, 7 U.S.C §§ 2131 *et seq.*, with respect to the keeping of exotic animals. The Act was silent as to the height requirement for fences used to house such animals. Following notice and comment, the Department promulgated a regulation entitled "structural strength." This regulation required facilities housing such animals to be "constructed of such material and of such strength as appropriate for the animals involved" and to be "structurally sound." 9 C.F.R. § 3.125(a). However, as with the statute, the regulation contained no express requirement that perimeter fences be a particular height. Nevertheless, the Department issued and enforced an internal memorandum which provided that all dangerous animals must be inside a perimeter fence at least 8 feet high.

The Seventh Circuit held that the "internal memorandum" constituted a legislative rule which required notice and comment to be effective. The court stated: "Even if . . .

the eight-foot rule is consistent with, even in some sense authorized by, the structural-strength regulation, it would not necessarily follow that it is an interpretive rule. *Id.* at 170. The court explained that in order to be an interpretive rule, a rule must be "derived from the regulation by a process reasonably described as interpretation." *Id.* The court classified the 8-foot rule as "arbitrary" (not in the "arbitrary or capricious" sense) but because it represented "an arbitrary choice among methods of implementation." The court emphasized that:

> ***A rule that turns on a number is likely to be arbitrary in this sense.*** There is no way to reason an eight-foot perimeter-fence rule as opposed to a seven-and-a-half foot fence or nine-foot fence or a ten-foot fence. None of these candidates for a rule is uniquely appropriate to, and in that sense derivable from, the duty of secure containment. This point becomes even clearer if we note that the eight-foot rule actually has another component – the fence must be at least three feet from any animal's pen. Why three feet? Why not four? Or two?

Id. (emphasis added). The court further stated that "[w]hen agencies base rules on arbitrary choices they are legislating, and so these rules are legislative or substantive and require notice and comment rulemaking, a procedure that is analogous to the procedure employed by legislatures in making statutes." *Id.* at 170-71. The court also stated that the rule was "arbitrary in the sense that it could well be different without significant impairment of any regulatory

purpose." *Id.* at 171; *see also Carlisle Tire & Rubber Co. v. United States*, 634 F. Supp. 419, 423 (CIT 1986) (Department of Commerce engaged in legislative rulemaking by adopting a position that antidumping margins of 0.5% or less were "de minimis").

Judge Posner's opinion in *Hoctor* succinctly demonstrates *why* the Department's Median Vertical Viewing Angle Rule and Median Horizontal Viewing Angle Rule constitute legislative rulemaking. To require movie theatres to provide wheelchair placements with viewing angles the same or less than the median vertical or horizontal viewing angle represents an arbitrary choice among methods of implementing the "lines of sight comparable" requirement of Standard 4.33.3. As with the 8-foot perimeter rule in *Hoctor*, the Department's rule is "arbitrary in the sense that it could well be different without significant impairment of any regulatory purpose." Why is the rule based on the "median" average rather than the "mean" average? How does one properly measure vertical and horizontal viewing angles in the context of a motion picture theatre? There is a significant question as to whether a vertical and horizontal viewing angle test, as defined by the Department of Justice, is the appropriate way to measure line of sight in a movie theatre. In short, there are several factors to consider in determining whether a particular "line of sight" is "comparable." It was clearly arbitrary for the Department to determine that comparability of lines of sight must be achieved through a vertical and/or horizontal viewing angle based on the median viewing angle.

Appendix A

In *Hoctor*, the Agriculture Department's enforcement of an internal policy adopted without notice and comment caused "some unknown fraction" of the thousands of animal dealers in the U.S. to "face the prospect of having to tear down their existing fences and build new, higher ones at great cost." 82 F.3d at 171. The agency was admonished to "listen to" the concerns of such dealers "before settling on a final rule" which imposed a perimeter fence height requirement. Similarly here, there are hundreds of movie theatres across the country whose operators now face the prospect of having to redesign existing theatres at great cost. The Department should not be permitted to impose a specific vertical or horizontal viewing angle requirement for wheelchair placements in movie theatres until after the Department has "listened to" the concerns of such operators.

This is especially true given that the Department's new "Median Vertical Viewing Angle Rule" and "Median Horizontal Viewing Angle Rule" are inconsistent with the Department's prior pronouncements. Until its amicus brief in *Lara*, the Department had maintained that wheelchair seating in theatres of 301 seats or less could be anywhere in the general seating requirement of the auditorium, as long as the patron's view was not obstructed. The Department also had taken the position that wheelchair locations near entranceways were ideal, especially in auditoriums of any size having sight lines that require slopes of greater than 5 percent, as provided in the plain language of section 4.33.3.

Prior notice and comment is especially necessary here because of the Department's reliance upon the SMPTE Guideline for its position that vertical viewing angles should

not exceed 35 degree. The SMPTE Guideline does not purport to portray custom in the movie theatre industry - but rather, a lofty objective. ("Good design has often been compromised by practical solutions and the belief that effective cinemas are not economically feasible"). Moreover, such a study should be subjected to the scrutiny of the notice and comment process.

"An agency's denial of a fair opportunity to comment on a key study may fatally taint the agency's decisional process." *National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners v. FERC*, 737 F.2d 1005 (1984), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 1227 (1985) (agency's denial of fair opportunity to comment on a key staff study may fatally taint the agency's decisional process); *United States Lines, Inc. v. FMC*, 584 F.2d 519, 534 (D.C. Cir. 1978) ("we have required information in agency files or reports identified by the agency as relevant to the proceeding to be disclosed to the parties for adversarial comment. . . . Such requirements . . . ensure that parties to agency proceedings are afforded the opportunities guaranteed by statute meaningfully to participate in those proceedings. . . .") . In *Idaho Farm Bureau, Federation v. Babbitt*, 58 F.3d 1392, 1403-04 (9th Cir. 1995), the Fish and Wildlife Service violated the APA by relying extensively on a provisional report not subjected to public notice and comment. The court stressed that the "necessity for notice and opportunity to comment on the USGS study was greatly heightened because [the agency] relied largely on the USGS study to support its final rule," and that "[o]pportunity for public comment is particularly crucial when the accuracy of important material in the record is in question." *Id.* at 1403.

Finally, the need for a formal rulemaking is further mandated by the fact that the Department's Median Vertical Viewing Angle Rule and Median Horizontal Viewing Angle Rule are contrary to the Access Board's "ADAAG Manual." Although the Manual states that "industry conventions and practices" should be looked to in complying with Section 4.33.3, there is no indication that the Department has done so in adopting and enforcing its rules. In addition, the Manual recommends wheelchair placements for public auditoriums which almost uniformly would fail to meet the requirements of the Department's rules. Such inconsistencies with the pronouncements of the Access Board further demonstrate why the Department needs to subject its rules for wheelchair placements in stadium style movie theatres to the notice and comment procedures mandated by the APA.

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, Petitioner NATO, on behalf of its members, respectfully requests that the Department replace its improperly adopted Median Vertical Viewing Angle Rule and Median Horizontal Viewing Angle Rule with a new, lawful rule regarding the placement of wheelchair spaces in stadium style seating auditoriums promulgated in compliance with the prior-notice-and-comment requirements of the APA. Attached hereto as Exhibit B, is a proposed rule that NATO believes effectively meets the requirements of the ADA.

Appendix A

Respectfully submitted,

GALLAND, KHARASCH, GREENBERG
FELLMAN AND SWIRSKY, P.C.

s/ Steven John Fellman
M. Roy Goldberg
Canal Square
1054 Thirty-First Street, N.W., Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20007-4492
(202) 342-5200
(202) 342-5219/Fax

Attorneys for Petitioner National
Association of Theatre Owners

Dated: August 24, 1999

APPENDIX B — LETTER FROM BILL LANN LEE TO STEVEN JOHN FELLMAN, ESQ. DATED APRIL 3, 2000

U. S. Department of justice

Civil Rights Division

Office of the Assistant Attorney General
Washington, D.C. 20530

Steven John Fellman, Esq.
M. Roy Goldberg, Esq.
Galland, Kharasch, Greenberg, Fellman & Swirsky, P.C.
Canal Square
1054 Thirty-First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007-4492

Dear Sirs:

The Attorney General has asked me to respond to your petition on behalf of the National Association of Theatre Owners (NATO). NATO is requesting that the Department of Justice promulgate a rule for the placement of wheelchair spaces in "stadium style" motion picture theater auditoriums.

In support of its petition, NATO provided a lengthy memorandum that reiterates the arguments now being made by individual NATO members who are involved in litigation with the Department of Justice. The Department's response to these arguments will be made in the appropriate judicial forums.

Appendix B

However, regardless of the outcome of the pending litigation, the Department is planning to review and amend the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) regulations in the next year. As you know, the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (Access Board) has completed a comprehensive review of its ADA Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG) and has published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) to update and amend the guidelines. Section 306 of the ADA requires the Attorney General to promulgate regulations that are consistent with the Access Board's minimum guidelines. Consequently, the Department of Justice will issue a NPRM this year proposing to update its ADA Standards for Accessible Design in order to maintain the Standards' consistency with ADAAG. At the same time, the Department will review its title III regulation to clarify a variety of issues. In response to your petition, the Department will consider further clarification of the assembly area seating requirements at that time.

In the meantime, I have shared a copy of your petition for rulemaking with the Access Board so that the Board may incorporate your comments into its rulemaking record.

Sincerely,

s/ Bill Lann Lee
Bill Lann Lee
Acting Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division